

REMARKS

Claims 16 and 17 have been withdrawn by constructive election.

Claim 15

Claim 15 stands rejected for the following reason stated on page 2 of the Office Letter, viz.
“Specifically, the obtaining the resistivity by dry etching without annealing is not discussed in the specification.” It is not believed that discussion therefore is discussed at page 4, line 5 of applicants’ specification.

Also, states that “Although different existing (prior art) systems may exhibit some of the desired properties, the novelty of this system is that these resistors exhibit all of the desired properties simultaneously....

Further, claim 15 relates to the further desired property simultaneous to those discussed above, viz. high resistivity ($\sim 0.2\text{-}1.5 \times 10^2 \Omega\text{-cm}$). All of the above desired properties are believed not found simultaneously in cermet film resistors of the prior art of record including Hohenstein showing r.f. etching. As a consequence, it is believed that claim 15 defining applicants’ contribution is worthy of Letters Patent.

Claims 13, 14, and 15

Claims 13, 14, and 15 stand rejected over Norimitsu ('101) in view of Kaiser et al. (417), Hohenstein and Jankowski et al. ('722) under 35 U.S.C. 103.

The failings of Norimitsu, the primary reference, are listed in the penultimate paragraph on page 4 of the Office Letter, viz.:

“The differences between Norimitsu and the present claims is co-sputtering if not discussed, is that co-sputtering utilizing DC for the metal target and RF for the insulator target is not discussed, the requirement for power is not discussed, the etching is not discussed, the use of a magnetron is not discussed and the thickness of a resistive film is not discussed.”

The three further references over the primary reference Norimitsu show various features pointed out by the rejection on pages 4-7 of the Office Letter concluding that it would be "obvious to one of ordinary skill" to so modify Norimitsu.

Returning to applicants' specification at page 4 as hereinbefore mentioned: "Although different existing systems may exhibit some of the desirable properties, the novelty of this system is that the (claimed) cermet thin film resistors exhibit all of the desired properties simultaneously" which is the antithesis of the cumulative art rejection made with respect to the claims.

Accordingly, it is believed that this application proffers claims directed to unobvious subject matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103, which Notice is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Conrad O. Gardner
Registration No.: 22,462
Telephone: 206-655-5510

The Boeing Company
P.O. Box 3707, M/C 11-XT
Seattle, WA 98124-2207